

PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of : Carl Rajsic  
For : METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR  
SECURELY ESTABLISHING L3-SVC  
CONNECTIONS  
Serial No.: 10/814,330  
Filed : April 1, 2004  
Art Unit : 2619  
Examiner : Michael J. Moore, Jr.  
Att. Docket : ALC 3124  
Confirmation No. : 5344

**REPLY BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on June 27, 2008.

**I. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-13 are on appeal.

Claims 1-13 are pending.

No claims are allowed.

Claims 1-13 are rejected.

## II. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The following grounds of rejection are presented for review:

A. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,130,393 to Hall, Jr. et al. (hereinafter "Hall").

B. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hall in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0064159 to Shirakawa (hereinafter "Shirakawa").

C. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hall in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,278 to Bi et al. (hereinafter "Bi").

### III. ARGUMENTS

The following remarks are directed to the new points of argument raised in the Examiner's Answer mailed June 27, 2008. In section 10-13 on page 10, entitled "Response to Argument", the Examiner's Answer puts forth several new arguments in response to Appellant's Appeal Brief. Appellant will respond to each of the Examiner's new arguments in turn.

#### A. Independent Claim 1

On page 7 of Appellant's Brief, Appellant argued that Hall does not teach or suggest "configuring the terminating MSS with anticipated security information" (emphasis added). In response, page 10 of the Examiner's Answer alleges that "Hall teaches MSCP 44 (terminating MSS) gathering (configured with) all called party closed user group identifiers (anticipated security information)" in lines 57-59 of col. 19. The Examiner further alleges, on pages 10-11, that "called party closed user group identifiers can be considered anticipated security information" because they are "expected to be found (anticipated) in order to establish a connection" in lines 1-22 of col. 20.

Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner's alleged "gathering" does not correspond to the recited step of "configuring" a terminating MSS. First, contrary to the Examiner's Answer, the word "gathering" does not appear in lines 57-59 of col. 19. Second, Appellant respectfully submits that the actual words in that section, "retrieved or are made readily available," have nothing to do with configuring a MSS with specified information.

Furthermore, Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner's allegation that "closed user group identifiers" correspond to the recited "anticipated security information" misconstrues

the Hall reference. As stated on page 7 of the Appeal Brief, Hall retrieves all identifiers rather than selecting only anticipated security information. Moreover, the section of Hall cited by the Examiner discloses nothing about identifiers that are “expected” to be found. Instead, lines 2-3 of col. 20 only disclose finding or locating a common identifier.

B. Independent Claims 10, 11, and 13

On page 8 of Appellant's Brief, Appellant argued that Hall does not teach or suggest “embedded security information compared with anticipated security information” or “whether the embedded security information corresponds to the anticipated security information” (emphasis added). In response, page 11 of the Examiner's Answer alleges that Hall teaches “the determination of whether a closed group identifier (embedded and anticipated security information) that is common (match) to both the calling party and the called party” as set forth in lines 1-22 of col. 20. Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner's allegation misconstrues Hall, as the same identifiers clearly could not function as both embedded and anticipated security information.


Appellant respectfully submits that the remaining points of argument set forth in the Examiner's Answer are repetitive and were therefore fully addressed in Appellant's Appeal Brief. For the reasons set forth herein and in the Appeal Brief, Appellant respectfully requests that the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reversed.

Application No: 10/814,330  
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3124

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,  
**KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.**

Date: August 27, 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Terry W. Kramer  
Registration No.: 41,541

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.  
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone: 703-519-9801  
Fax: 703-519-9802